# **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 3. This sheet, which includes FIG. 3, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

#### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6-9, and 12-18 are amended by this Amendment. Claims 2-5 and 10-11 are canceled by this Amendment. No new claims are added by this Amendment.

## **Drawing Objections**

The Examiner objects to the drawings because FIG. 3 discloses "Playback of Moive & Still" wherein "Moive" should be "Movie." Applicant respectfully submits that the FIG. 3 is corrected in the attached Replacement Sheet. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

#### **Specification Objections**

The Examiner objects to the abstract of the disclosure because it does not contain more than 50 words. Applicant respectfully submits the abstract is amended to include more than 50 words. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 5-7 and 9 stand objected to because the Examiner asserts "the one of the playitem field" wherein "the" from "the one" should be removed since it lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-7 and 9 are canceled or amended to address the Examiner's assertion. In particular, the recitations noted by the Examiner are amended in an alternative manner to that suggested above by the Examiner in order to clarify said recitations for

the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner asserts the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 6-9, and 12-13 are amended to be directed to a "computer readable medium" as seemingly suggested by the Examiner, and are therefore directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

# **Discussion of Example Embodiments**

Applicant provides the following discussion in order to clarify features of example embodiments for the Examiner. Example embodiments as shown in FIG. 12A may allow first navigation information to be provided by one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field and second navigation information be provided by one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field that is different from that which provides the first navigation information. For example, if the first navigation information is provided by a sub-playitem field, the second navigation information may be provided by a playitem field. Therefore, the fields providing the first navigation information and the second navigation information may be different, e.g., one may be a sub-playitem field and the other may be a playitem field.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,385,389, herein Maruyama). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner asserts at page 5 of the current Office Action that Maruyama at FIG. 13 teaches "the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the first navigation information is different from the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the second navigation information" as required by amended claim 1. In particular, the Examiner asserts that VOBU(#n) is different from VOBU(#n-1), and that each of VOBU(#n) and VOBU(#n-1) contain respective navigation packs NV\_PCK. However, both VOBU(#n) 85 and VOBU(#n+1) 85 are video object units (VOBU) 85. Therefore, VOBU(#n) 85 is not different from VOBU(#n+1) 85. To the contrary, they are the same type "VOBU 85." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Maruyama fails to disclose "the one of a playitem field and a subplayitem field providing the first navigation information is different from the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the second navigation information" as required by amended claim 1.

Further, Maruyama discloses at col. 12 lines 11-18 "Each video object unit 85 is constituted as a set (pack sequence) of video packs (V packs) 88, sub-picture packs (SP packs 90), and audio packs (A packs) 91 to have navigation pack (NV pack) 86 at the beginning of the sequence. That is, video object unit VOBU 85 is defined as a set of all packs recorded from certain navigation pack 86 to a pack immediately before the next navigation pack 86." Therefore, as shown in FIG. 11, the video packs 88, the sub-picture packs 90, and the audio packs 91 after the first navigation pack 86 until the next navigation pack 86 are for the first navigation pack 86. Therefore, Maruyama fails to disclose that a field providing navigation

information regarding a still image in a first file is a <u>separate</u> field from a field providing navigation information regarding audio data in a second file, and/or first navigation information for a first file including at least one still image and <u>separate</u> second navigation information for a second file including audio data. To the contrary, the first navigation pack 86 in FIG. 11 of Maruyama is for <u>all</u> of the video packs 88, the sub-picture packs 90, <u>and</u> the audio packs 91 until the next navigation pack at the beginning of the next video object unit 85. Therefore, the same navigation pack 86 is for both the sub-picture packs 90 <u>and</u> the audio packs 91 in each a video object unit 85. Accordingly, Maruyama fails to disclose "first navigation information providing presentation information regarding the still image in the first file, and second navigation information providing presentation information regarding audio data in the second file...one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field provides the first navigation information...one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field provides the second navigation information...the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the first navigation information is different from the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the second navigation information information is different from the one of a playitem field and a sub-playitem field providing the first navigation information inform

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Further, Applicant submits that claims 14-18 are amended to include features somewhat similar to those discussed above in regards to amended claim 1, and, therefore, that amended claims 14-18 are patentable for at least somewhat similar reasons as amended claim 1. Applicant also respectfully submits that claims 6-9 and 12, which depend from amended claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to amended claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/653,235 Attorney Docket No.1740-000048/US

**CONCLUSION** 

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the

objections and rejections and allowance of each of the claims in connection with the present

application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1)

month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the

required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone

number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension

of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Rν

For Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195

(703) 668-8000

GDY/AAM: tlt

Page 15